

Dear Selectmen:

The question before you is and only is whether the submitted Proposal complies with the RFP and if you will or will not accept the proposal. Yes or No if you will allow for this project to go forward and to have this proposal constructed in the neighborhood and the center of town.

Whatever the afterward or “what if’s” for the building if not accepted is not the question. The question as stated Is a simple one ... do you agree with the proposal and feel it should proceed.

Though a few may disagree with my comments but no matter what...there are too many neighborhoods / town center altering valid points which have lead me to decide to oppose the feasibility and overall merits of the proposal

My reasoning for being against the revised proposal are as follows:

- The proposer submitted a revised plan in which the only change was the turning of the building. The developer had said he cannot lower the number of units down from 62, this is his threshold and must maintain it. This is simply too big for the land area and surrounding neighborhood.
- I had hoped for complete In-depth answers to the questions posed by the resident of town but instead received a very vague evasive response which is concerning.
- The neighborhood is a tight congested area and would be adding 68 ++ more car activity plus all associated extras; visiting parking, healthcare workers, loading, handicap parking and daily routine traffic of the site creates an extremely dangerous and congested nightmare for the area.
- Total 62 units =56 one bedroom 1 car and 6 two bedrooms. 12 car. Total needed parking spaces for residents only 68 spaces. Proposed total 78 parking spot ... of the additional 10 proposed extra spots.... some are mandated and required to be handicap parking spaces for visitor etc. Say 5 spaces which leaves Only an additional 5 spaces for guest, visiting nurses, etc...If you gather that half of the one bedroom will have an additional car =28 additional cars. If you gather if all the two bedrooms would have 4 Cars = 12 additional cars. So bottom Line based on these assumptions there would be ...approx. 40 +- cars needing to park elsewhere on the street...This is very modest Number and I feel it would be higher. but being conservative. Not to mention there is only an extra 5 spaces in the complex for visitor parking etc.... so a majority of visitors, home healthcare agents, visiting nurses would be parking in the streets of chestnut, Center, union, pleasant, south. Parking cannot be on both sides of the street due to the narrowness of the streets. And additional 40 cars would completely engulf the surrounding streets and neighborhood. In order to alleviate Parking issues, they would have to go further a s deeper into the playground / park area for space or the front of Rogers building currently where there is the grass space and make that additional parking.
- The neighborhood playground / park space Is seriously diminished no matter what angle or spin you out on it. Though they say the baseball field stays followed by that’s the town choice but you can’t have baseballs hitting the cars in the parking lot so low the town needs to construct a huge screen of some sort? Basketball court area is gone. The “green space” becomes a looming asphalt lot, lit up at night like a beacon. IT is not accurately depicted on the diagrams, Walking the area clarifies that.
- If there is open green space and community park nears homes, there is clear evidence to an increase in home values of anywhere from 8-20% and attracts Families to homes that have community

neighborhood park nearby. This is the positive aspect which needs to be emphasized for a town seeking a new younger generation to grow. There is nothing that addresses the aspect of decline in home values when a project such as this is built in a tight neighborhood. With home values declining the reassessments of the value will have to be made and reduced taxes coming in from year one.

- Green space in the center of town and owned by the town is nonexistent and to permanently give up such space is seriously questionable especially when the town is attracting younger people and families with small children to the town. A view on a summer day to the area is full of little ones and parents playing in the area, People walking and playing with their dogs etc...
- The proposer is seeking “\$500,000” from CPC money same as Oxford did with the reasoning it will show the state that the town is serious about the project. No CPC tax payer money should be allowed for a building we do not own especially when we have our own building to care for.
- The proposer wants a 10-year sliding scale in taxes and possibly longer depending on the project. The town will not see such a return right away and instant money to the Bank but will see reduced money from all the abutters to the proposal.
- There is guarantees of restricted deed, but that would only apply only to the historic school part and the other areas and grounds can become anything with no control over it.
- There is no answer to say that after the 15-year federal and state Tax Credit is no longer required the proper can be sold and yet they do not specify if they have sold other projects they have done and Ike Many do they keep? If sold sure the Rogers Building is deeded but the addition section is not part of the historical deed and become anything the new owners feel fit.
- The claim there is such a dire extensive need for housing for our seniors. There has been no evidence or factual numbers presented that Fairhaven residents are being driven from town like a mass exodus due to no housing. Vague innuendos and comments but again no factual numbers that impact Fairhaven residents. There is a fact that Fairhaven has more affordable housing than some of its neighboring towns, so are we trying to draw the senior from another town to our town? Where are the factual numbers to back this claim up? How many homes were actually sold because they were too old and were forced out of Town due to no housing or chose to leave and live in Florida?

Special zoning was approved § 198-29.8. Historic site reuse special permit. [Added 5-4-2019 STM by Art. 13]

Purpose.

- The purpose of the historic site reuse special permit is to promote the adaptive reuse of eligible municipally owned buildings no longer used by the Town for municipal purposes for residential use that protects the historic character by modifying those general zoning regulations, including parking and loading, lot and building dimensions, density and use limitations, which would otherwise make such preservation infeasible, while protecting the health, welfare, aesthetics and character of the neighboring community.

Eligible building and lot.

Any municipally owned building constructed before 1920 and no longer used by the Town for municipal purposes will be eligible for consideration for a special permit under this section. The lot on which an eligible building is situated, and any adjoining lots which were used in common with the eligible building for its principal municipal use shall be eligible for a historic site reuse special permit

- The planning board overall say will be impacted by this special permit. The question was never answered by the proposer that since this is a 40B affordable housing project for 55+ the proposals can and will appeal to the state (which very rarely supports the planning Board decisions) if the planning board does not approve of certain aspects of the proposal the State will now dictate and allow and you cannot stop it.

The language of the RFP was clear on the development concept.

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

- The development project should consider the historical significance of the property as well as the historical significance of the surrounding properties. The development project should seek to restore, in conformance with applicable preservation standards, the architectural elements of the property. Further, the architectural design of all project components should resemble the human scale of traditional Fairhaven architecture and shall be compatible with the surrounding municipal, residential, and commercial properties
- This project does not match the human scale of single families in a congested neighborhood and not compatible with the surrounding residential properties. The sheer scale and volume of units proposed is not compatible.

1. Massing and Character

- The project should exhibit strong design relationships with neighboring properties, particularly with the orderly pattern established by the street alignment and siting of buildings
- This proposal does not exhibit strong design relationship with neighboring properties and creates a disruption to the street and traffic patterns in a congested mainly single-family neighborhood.

Overall, the project sounds like a great idea but it's sheer large size simply does not fit in the area. To we can "make it work" simply implies that it would not work otherwise but we will force any way to make it fit. This logic is not acceptable. There are no "do-overs" or we should of this or that. This decision will impact not only the residents of the area, the town center and the town itself permanently and I do not fee for the better.

Thank you

Lee Baumgartner
97 Pleasant Street